

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed February 8, 2006.

Currently, claims 1-38, 41-48, 50-62 and 64-84 are pending. Applicants have amended claims 1, 26, 50, 65, 71 and 80, and cancelled claims 6, 14, 18, 25, 48, 62, 64, 70, 79, and 84. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1-38, 41-48, 50-62 and 64-84.

I. Summary of the Examiner's Objections

Claim 64 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-11, 14-16, 19-22, 25-36, 42-45, 48, 50-54, 62, 64-74, and 79-84 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kakimoto et al* (U.S. 5,522,683) in view of *Olds* (U.S. 5,741,096).

Claims 12, 13, 17, 18, 23, 24, 37, 38, 41, 55-61, and 75-78 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kakimoto* in view of *Olds*, as applied to Claims 1, 26, 50, and 75, and in further view of *Dils et al.* (U.S. 2004/0265079).

II. Remarks

Objections to Claims 6, 14, 18, 25, 48, 62, 64, 70, 79 and 84.

Claims 6, 14, 18, 25, 48, 62, 70, 79, and 84 have been deleted. Claim 64 has been deleted. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the objections to Claims 6, 14, 18, 25, 48, 62, 70, 79, and 84 and the rejection of claim 64 are now moot.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 USC Section 103.

It is respectfully submitted that *Olds* in combination with *Kakimoto et al.* does not render a tool utility “a laser guide line *impinging on the tool*” obvious. There is no teaching in either reference of a tool having any laser guide line impinging at least a portion of the tool.

As amended, Claim 1 provides:

a first guide system providing a first laser guide line; and
a tool including:
an action component adapted to operate on said work piece by *following the laser guide line impinging on the tool*,
a guide detector adapted to detect a position of said first laser guide line *impinging on the guide detector* and provide first guide position data corresponding to said position of said first guide, and

The references, even if combined in the manner suggested by the Examiner, do not render the claimed invention obvious. *Kakimoto et al.* is directed to an automated drilling system for printed circuit boards. *Kakimoto et al.* teaches finding a point and moving a tool toward that point.

As admitted by the Examiner, *Olds* teaches that “... two laser line guide beams are projected onto the *workpiece*... intersect to form a mark... [t]hen the operator searches for the mark and... uses it to lime up the action component.” The beam is not projected onto the action component or tool, nor any “guide detector” as defined in the claim.

There is no teaching in either *Kakimoto et al.* or *Olds* of claimed action component, nor of any guide detector “... to detect a position of said first laser guide line *impinging on the guide detector*”.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that, contrary to the Examiner’s position, the disclosure of *Olds*, in showing an alignment marker on a workpiece e.g. a reference point – does not constitute teaching a “guide line”. In operation, the drill device does not have “an action component ... *following the laser guide line impinging on the tool*” as defined in claim 1.

Hence, since neither *Kakimoto et al.* nor *Olds* teaches a guide line “impinging” on the tool, nor a guide detector as defined, it is respectfully submitted one of average skill would not find it

obvious either to combine the references to achieve such a guide detector as even such a combination would not result in the claimed invention.

Independent claim 26 includes limitations similar to those set forth above making clear the operation of the tool is not obvious in view of the prior art:

an action component adapted to operate piece on said work piece relative to a laser guide line *impinging on the tool*,

a guide detector adapted to detect a position of at least a first laser guide line impinging upon the guide detector and provide first guide position data corresponding to said position of said first laser guide line; and

Further, independent claim 50 includes limitations similar to those set forth above including:

a location detector adapted to determine an orientation of said component relative to the laser line, based at least in part on a position of a set of one or more laser guide lines *impinging upon the action component*

Likewise, independent claim 71 includes similar limitations:

one or more processing devices in communication with said one or more storage devices and said action component, said one or more processing devices including code instructing the devices to perform a method comprising the steps of:

(a) determining an orientation of said tool based at least in part on a position of a set of one or more laser guide lines *impinging upon said tool*; and

The combined references would not render the claimed action component, guide detector and location detector, operating with respect to a “laser guide line” impinging the tool or detector as defined in the claims. For the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted claim 50 and claims 51-64 dependent from claim 50, and claim 71 along with claims 72-79 dependent from claim 71 and including all the limitations thereof, is not obvious.

Based on the above amendments and these remarks, reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The Examiner’s prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including today, August 8, 2006.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 8, 2006

By: /Larry E. Vierra/
Larry E. Vierra
Reg. No. 33,809

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DENIRO LLP
575 Market Street, Suite 2500
San Francisco, California 94105-2871
Telephone: (415) 369-9660
Facsimile: (415) 369-9665